

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 22, 2008, claims 1-6 were rejected. Additionally, the drawings were objected to. Additionally, the specification was objected to. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added or canceled.

For reference, claims 1, 5, and 6 are currently amended. In particular, claims 1 and 6 are amended to clarify the language of the claims. Claim 5 is amended to depend from claim 4.

### Objections to the Drawings

The current application is a U.S. National Stage application. The drawing requirements for U.S. National Stage applications are identified in MPEP 1825 and labeling of figures as “Prior Art” is not required (see PCT Rule 11.11). Further, MPEP 1893.03(f) states that “[t]he USPTO may not impose requirements beyond those imposed by the Patent Cooperation Treaty (e.g., PCT Rule 11).” In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that labeling Figure 1 as “Prior Art” is not required in the current application.

### Objections to the Specification

The Office Action suggests that section headings be added to the specification, according to the guidelines set forth in the MPEP. Applicant notes that the suggested section headings are not required and, hence, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the specification to include the indicated section headings.

The Office Action also objects to the disclosure on page 4, line 27, because the designation “451” is used for both the asynchronous processor and the clock fail detection circuit. Applicants submit that the indicated language is amended to refer to the clock fail detection circuit 452. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

### Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 5, and 6 for the following informalities. In particular, claims 1 and 6 are objected to as the phrase “bring the electronic circuit arrangement in a pre-defined state” is grammatically incorrect. Additionally, claim 5 is objected to because the phrase “bus station as claimed in claim 3” lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 1 and 6 are amended to clarify the language of the claims. Claim 5 is amended to depend from claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1, 5, and 6 be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Floyd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,089,462, hereinafter Floyd). Additionally, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Floyd in view of Pohlmeier et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,959,014, hereinafter Pohlmeier). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Floyd and Pohlmeier for the reasons provided below.

#### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “an asynchronous processor arranged to receive said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal” (emphasis added).

In contrast, Floyd does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Floyd does not disclose an asynchronous processor arranged to receive said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal. The Office Action states that Floyd discloses an asynchronous processor arranged for receiving said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit arrangement in a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal. Office Action, 9/22/08, page 4 (citing Floyd, Fig. 1, 34A-B, and col. 1, lines 25-35). However, the service processors 34A-B do not bring the electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state upon the detection of the error signal. Floyd describes the service processors 34A-B as providing fault supervision, startup assistance, and test capability to processor group 5, and the

service processors may have their own interconnect paths to other processor groups as well as connecting all of processors 30A-D. Floyd, col. 2, lines 45-50. Floyd also describes that the service processors 34A-B can intercommunicate with service processors in other processor groups and are operated from an independent clock. Floyd, col. 3, lines 37-42. Floyd describes that several actions can be taken in response to the clock fault output signal assertion, including stopping processor 10, stopping the entire multiprocessing system and/or isolating processor group 5 from other processor groups. Floyd, col. 3, lines 35-40. However, Floyd does not disclose how these predetermined actions might be accomplished. More specifically, Floyd does not disclose that the service processors 34A-B might perform these tasks. Thus, Floyd is silent on a processor that receives an error signal and brings the electronic circuit arrangement into a predefined state upon detection of the error signal.

Therefore, Floyd does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1 because Floyd does not disclose an independent asynchronous processor arranged to receive said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn because the cited reference fails to disclose all the limitations of the claim.

#### Independent Claim 6

Applicant respectfully asserts independent claim 6 is patentable over Floyd at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of claim 1. In particular, claim 6 recites “bringing the electronic circuit arrangement into the predetermined state using an asynchronous processor within the electronic circuit arrangement” (emphasis added).

Here, although the language of claim 6 differs from the language of claim 1, and the scope of claim 6 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejection of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts claim 6 is patentable over Floyd because Floyd does not disclose bringing the electronic circuit

arrangement into the predetermined state using an asynchronous processor within the electronic circuit arrangement.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-5 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 2-5 are allowable based on the allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 2-5 may be allowable for further reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: December 19, 2008

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111